

9/1/68

Mr. Raymond W. Boulanger
Assistant to the General Counsel
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20310

Dear Mr. Boulanger,

I have delayed responding to your letter of the 15th of August in the hope of finding time to do what the law does not require of me, comb a number of files to specify the error in your letter. Because this has not been possible, I can only reply I can without it.

First of all, to date you have been non-responsive in some areas. I will not again go into this. The obligation to comply with these requests is yours and in possible.

Second, despite what you say, the Rowell reports and picture are in existence, and if your own people inform you erroneously, the law imposes other burdens upon you, I, a non-lawyer, am not about to read you a lecture on the law. Aside from this, would you believe it were you in any other position if the Army told you it had an intelligence agent at the scene of the murder of a President, with a camera, and that he took pictures and filed reports through channels and they no longer exist? I have complied with the law by making proper identification, and I tell you that whether or not you have been told these no longer exist, they do.

On the basis of what has appeared in the papers alone, your references to the possible surveillance to which I was subjected are inadequate. Those records were stored in a place where I could not access them. Again the law, as I read the official interpretation, imposes responsibilities upon you that you have not met. You ask for my opinion the Army may have had in spying on me. May I ask you about some of the others who were without doubt spied upon, including members of the Congress? Would you, in this case, argue only that there was no apparent reason, at least one not apparent to you? If it seemed only prudent and logical to check the law, it also seems inadequate to have done this alone.

As you are unable to supply the names of the agents who spied upon me I now can't know. I have supplied the places and times, and I repeat them, in Minneapolis and St. Paul, in mid-July 1968, and at the University of Minnesota and at Radio Station where they were observed. This should be enough to "provide" you "with a basis for making...to the particulars." You might also ask them about the report, too, for it is there that they were intercepted, and damaged and pilfered.

I am disturbed that the office of the General Counsel of the Army is so non-responsive and evasive in reaction to proper requests under the law and in the face of so clear a transgression into the rights of all Americans and against the law. I do hope you will, if only to close, begin to get the information to which I am entitled and which it is within your power to get. I'll then supply it to me.

Sincerely,